

VZCZCXYZ0007
PP RUEHWEB

DE RUEHC #5962 0982008
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 072000Z APR 08
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO RUEHRL/AMEMBASSY BERLIN PRIORITY 0000
RUEHSW/AMEMBASSY BERN PRIORITY 0000
RUEHBS/AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS PRIORITY 0000
RUEHBY/AMEMBASSY CANBERRA PRIORITY 0000
RUEHCP/AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN PRIORITY 0000
RUEHDL/AMEMBASSY DUBLIN PRIORITY 0000
RUEHHE/AMEMBASSY HELSINKI PRIORITY 0000
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 0000
RUEHLO/AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY 0000
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 0000
RUEHNY/AMEMBASSY OSLO PRIORITY 0000
RUEHOT/AMEMBASSY OTTAWA PRIORITY 0000
RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS PRIORITY 0000
RUEHPG/AMEMBASSY PRAGUE PRIORITY 0000
RUEHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME PRIORITY 0000
RUEHUL/AMEMBASSY SEOUL PRIORITY 0000
RUEHSM/AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM PRIORITY 0000
RUEHTC/AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE PRIORITY 0000
RUEHKO/AMEMBASSY TOKYO PRIORITY 0000
RUEHWR/AMEMBASSY WARSAW PRIORITY 0000
RUEHWL/AMEMBASSY WELLINGTON PRIORITY 0000
RUEHBS/USEU BRUSSELS PRIORITY

UNCLAS STATE 035962

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [CA](#) [CBC](#) [ETTC](#) [FR](#) [GM](#) [JA](#) [KNNP](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [TRGY](#) [UK](#)
SUBJECT: MARCH 26 MEETING OF THE G-8 GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP
WORKING GROUP IN TOKYO

REF: STATE 13105

SUMMARY

¶1. (SBU) AT THE MARCH 26 G-8 GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP WORKING GROUP MEETING (GPWG), RUSSIA POURED MORE COLD WATER ON THE PROPOSAL TO EXPAND GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP (GP) ACTIVITIES BEYOND RUSSIA AND THE REST OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION (FSU) -- THE PROPOSAL SUPPORTED BY ALL OTHER G-8 MEMBERS AND THE MAJOR GP OBJECTIVE FOR THE U.S. UNDER JAPAN'S G-8 PRESIDENCY. AT THE TABLE AND ON THE MARGINS, RUSSIA MADE CLEAR IT WOULD OPPOSE ANY SUMMIT LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC EXPANSION THIS YEAR, CITING THE NEED TO FINISH THE PROMISED PROJECTS IN RUSSIA FIRST. DURING DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE STATE OF GP PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION IN RUSSIA, THE RUSSIAN REPRESENTATIVE COMPLAINED ABOUT THE FAILURE OF SOME PARTNERS (IDENTIFIED ON THE MARGINS AS ITALY AND FRANCE, IN PARTICULAR) TO FULFILL THEIR GP PLEDGES OR TO RESPOND MEANINGFULLY TO RUSSIA'S EARLIER REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION OF THEIR INTENTIONS IN THAT REGARD. U.S. REPRESENTATIVE HAYWARD REAFFIRMED THE U.S. COMMITMENT TO FULFILL ITS PLEDGE IN RUSSIA, A COMMITMENT ECHOED BY MOST OTHER DELEGATIONS. SHE ALSO JOINED THE JAPANESE GPWG CHAIR AND OTHER DELEGATIONS IN DECLARING THAT THE GP HAS IN FACT -- IF NOT IN NAME -- ALREADY EXPANDED GEOGRAPHICALLY, AS ILLUSTRATED BY THE RANGE OF NONPROLIFERATION PROJECTS ALREADY BEING CARRIED OUT BY GP PARTNERS WORLDWIDE. THREAT BRIEFINGS BY THE U.S. AND OTHERS MADE THE CASE THAT THERE EXIST BOTH A WORLDWIDE THREAT AND A RISK THAT CURRENT THREAT REDUCTION EFFORTS MIGHT LEAVE GAPS THAT COULD BE EXPLOITED BY TERRORIST GROUPS OR PROLIFERANT STATES. THE JAPANESE CHAIR WAS COOL TO THE U.S. PROPOSAL THAT PROSPECTIVE NEW GP DONORS BE APPROACHED IN ORDER TO GENERATE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES TO HELP FILL SUCH GAPS, BUT AGREED THAT THERE COULD BE INFORMAL CONTACTS TO CONVEY

INFORMATION ABOUT THE GP, SUCH AS WITH KAZAKHSTAN. THIS EXPANDED GPWG SESSION INCLUDED THE G-8 PARTNERS, TWELVE OTHER DONOR NATIONS, THE EU COUNCIL SECRETARIAT, THE EU COMMISSION, THE IAEA, AND UKRAINE. END SUMMARY.

JAPAN'S AGENDA -- A TWO-PART ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF GP
EXPANSION

12. (SBU) AT THE JANUARY GPWG (REFTEL), RUSSIA HAD MINCED FEW WORDS IN COMPLAINING ABOUT THE UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF SEVERAL PARTNERS (MENTIONING ITALY, FRANCE, AND JAPAN) IN FULFILLING THEIR PLEDGES TO UNDERTAKE AND COMPLETE PROJECTS IN RUSSIA, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED IN 12002. AS THEY HAD LAST YEAR, THE RUSSIANS CONTINUED IN JANUARY AND MARCH TO ARGUE THAT THE FOCUS SHOULD BE ON UNFINISHED WORK IN RUSSIA INSTEAD OF ON EXPANDING TO NEW COUNTRIES. IN AN ATTEMPT TO MOVE THE RUSSIANS FROM THEIR OPPOSITION BY ADDRESSING THEIR CONCERNS ABOUT FUNDING SHORTFALLS, THE JAPANESE PRESIDENCY MADE A REVIEW OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION IN RUSSIA THE AGENDA'S FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS.

THE OTHER MAJOR AGENDA ITEM CONCERNED THREAT BRIEFINGS, INTENDED TO ESTABLISH THE URGENCY OF THE GLOBAL WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (WMD) PROLIFERATION THREAT AND THEREFORE THE NEED TO EXPAND THE GP GEOGRAPHICALLY TO MEET IT.

RUSSIA'S COMPLAINTS

13. (SBU) THE DISCUSSION OF IMPLEMENTATION STATE OF PLAY TOOK PLACE AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF TWO SETS OF DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED BEFORE THE GPWG: A CATALOGUE OF CHALLENGES COVERING IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS, AND A LISTING OF PROJECT BENCHMARKS AND ANTICIPATED TIMELINES -- BOTH DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY EACH OF THE GP DONORS. TO LEAD OFF, RUSSIAN HEAD OF DELEGATION ANTONOV CLAIMED RUSSIA HAD SO FAR RECEIVED ONLY 25 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL FUNDS PLEDGED TO IT, AS ILLUSTRATED ON A CHART. HE NOTED WITH REGRET THAT RUSSIA HAD RECEIVED NO RESPONSES TO ITS JANUARY REQUEST FOR CONFIRMATION FROM CERTAIN COUNTRIES -- WHICH HE LATER IDENTIFIED ON THE MARGINS AS ITALY AND FRANCE -- CONCERNING THEIR INTENTIONS WITH REGARD TO FULFILLING THEIR PLEDGES. IN THE ABSENCE OF SUCH CLARIFICATIONS, IT WAS DIFFICULT FOR RUSSIA TO IDENTIFY THE NECESSARY BENCHMARKS OR DO ITS OWN BUDGET PLANNING. THE MAIN PROBLEM WAS A LACK OF FUNDS FOR CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION (CWD). BASED ON A CHART COVERING GP ASSISTANCE RECEIVED FROM ALL COUNTRIES, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM ROSATOM THEN MADE A POWERPOINT PRESENTATION CONCERNING THE STATUS OF PROJECTS IN RUSSIA, SPECIFICALLY SUBMARINE DISMANTLEMENT IN THE RUSSIAN FAR EAST.

14. (SBU) SEVERAL DELEGATIONS NOTED THAT ADMINISTRATIVE OBSTACLES THEY HAD ENCOUNTERED IN RUSSIA HAD SLOWED THE TEMPO OF THEIR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION. A NUMBER OF COUNTRIES ALSO TOOK ISSUE WITH THE RUSSIAN CHART'S FIGURES, POINTING OUT THAT THEY CONCERNED ONLY THE MONIES EXPENDED DIRECTLY INSIDE RUSSIA, BUT NOT THE EQUIPMENT, SHIPPING, SERVICES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD COVERED BY EXPENDITURES OUTSIDE RUSSIA.

GERMANY NOTED THAT IT HAD COMMITTED \$1.2 BILLION IN 2002, NOT THE \$1.8 BILLION CLAIMED ON THE RUSSIAN CHART. FRANCE SAID

ITS FIGURE SHOULD BE SHOWN AS \$750 MILLION, NOT THE \$950 MILLION ON THE CHART. CANADA SAID ITS DISBURSEMENTS HAD BEEN SOMEWHAT DELAYED BY ITS OBLIGATION TO SPEND THE FUNDS EFFICIENTLY; OVER THE FIRST FIVE YEARS, IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES, INCLUDING TAXATION AND COORDINATION PROBLEMS, HAD SLOWED A PACE, BUT IT WAS HOPED THINGS WOULD NOW SPEED UP. KOREA ASKED WHY ITS ASSISTANCE DID NOT APPEAR IN THE RUSSIAN FIGURES.

15. (SBU) U.S. REPRESENTATIVE HAYWARD REITERATED THE U.S. COMMITMENT TO FULFILL ITS ENTIRE PLEDGE TO RUSSIA BY 2012. THE U.S. CATALOGUE OF CHALLENGES CONTAINED A RECORD OF PROBLEMS

SOLVED AND SUCCESSFUL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION. (WHEN ASKED ON THE MARGINS, THE RUSSIANS HAD NO COMPLAINT ABOUT U.S. IMPLEMENTATION. THEY ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THEIR PERCENTAGE FIGURE FOR PLEDGE FULFILLMENT, WHICH LISTED ONLY 31 PERCENT FOR

THE U.S., MIGHT WELL FALL SHORT OF THE REALITY SINCE IT A ADMITTEDLY INCLUDED ONLY MONIES TRANSFERRED TO RUSSIA AND NOT THOSE LEGITIMATE EXPENSES INCURRED OUTSIDE RUSSIA. WHILE THIS UNDERSTANDING APPLIED TO SOME OTHER DONORS AS WELL, IT DID NOT

APPLY TO ALL DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN RUSSIAN FIGURES AND DONORS' CLAIMS.) THE UK REPRESENTATIVE NOTED THE CHART'S 61 PERCENT COMPLETION FIGURE FOR HIS COUNTRY'S PROJECTS LOOKED ACCURATE AND AFFIRMED ITS COMMITMENT TO FINISH THE WORK IN RUSSIA AND UKRAINE. ITALY, WHICH THE RUSSIAN CHART SHOWED AS HAVING SPENT

ONLY 2 PERCENT OF ITS PLEDGE, SAID ITS OWN FIGURES FOR ITS ASSISTANCE "MIGHT BE A LITTLE HIGHER" THAN THOSE ON THE RUSSIAN CHART, AND IT "MIGHT HAVE SOME ADDITIONAL CONTRACTS TO ANNOUNCE SOON." FRANCE SAID IT "INTENDED TO WORK WITH RUSSIA TO IMPROVE" ITS IMPLEMENTATION RECORD. SWITZERLAND, THE EU, AND

THE NETHERLANDS BRIEFLY REVIEWED THEIR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION HISTORIES IN RUSSIA. THE UK NOTED THAT IT HAD ALLOCATED MORE GP FUNDS TO ROSATOM THAN ROSATOM HAD BEEN ABLE TO SPEND. MOST

DELEGATIONS ECHOED HAYWARD'S COMMITMENT WITH REGARD TO FULFILLMENT OF PLEDGES. THE NETHERLANDS DELEGATION REPORTED THAT ITS PARLIAMENT HAD QUESTIONED WHY THE GOVERNMENT WAS SUPPORTING A NOW PROSPEROUS RUSSIA WITH GP ASSISTANCE. THE RESPONSE TO PARLIAMENT WAS THAT SUCH ASSISTANCE SERVED A "COMMON

SECURITY INTEREST". NONETHELESS, THE DUTCH REPRESENTATIVE NOTED, HIS GOVERNMENT NEEDED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT HOW THE TAXPAYER VIEWED THE FUNDS PROVIDED UNDER THE GP.

16. (SBU) ANTONOV RESPONDED THAT THE ISSUE WAS NOT SO MUCH ONE OF

"COMMITMENTS", BUT RATHER OF ACTUALLY TRANSFORMING THEM INTO PROJECTS. RUSSIA HAD REAL PROBLEMS TO SOLVE: ECOLOGICAL ONES WITH REGARD TO SUBMARINE DISMANTLEMENT AND THE ISSUE OF TREATY

OBLIGATION WITH CWD. RUSSIA WOULD MEET THESE CHALLENGES -- WITH OR WITHOUT GP HELP. IT WAS SPENDING ITS OWN MONEY TO DO SO, BUT SIMPLY NEEDED TO KNOW THE ACTUAL PROSPECTS FOR ASSISTANCE.

17. (SBU) TO THOSE WHO HAD CITED DIFFICULTIES WITH SITE ACCESS

(MENTIONING ITALY), ANTONOV NOTED THAT, LIKE OTHERS, RUSSIA HAD CLEAR RULES ABOUT NOTIFICATIONS WITH WHICH PARTNERS SIMPLY HAD TO

COMPLY. REFERRING DIRECTLY TO FRANCE'S BENCHMARKS DOCUMENT, ANTONOV SAID, "THIS IS MONEY YOU SPENT SOMEPLACE ELSE." TO KOREA,

ANTONOV BRUSQUELY DISMISSED ITS QUESTION WITH THE COMMENT THAT IT HAD TRANSFERRED ITS FUNDS TO JAPAN (IN A "PIGGYBACK" PROCESS).

(FROM THE GPWG CHAIR MORINO LATER POINTEDLY REGRETTED THAT RUSSIA HAD NOT SEEN FIT TO THANK KOREA FOR ITS ASSISTANCE.) ANTONOV WENT

ON TO COMPLAIN THAT PIGGYBACKING WAS NOT AN APPROPRIATE WAY TO EXTEND ASSISTANCE FOR LARGE PROJECTS, THOUGH IT MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE FOR SMALL PROJECTS -- AN ARGUMENT THAT WAS INTERPRETED

PRIVATELY BY OTHER DELEGATIONS AS THE RUSSIANS' DESIRE TO HAVE THE CHECKS WRITTEN DIRECTLY TO THEM.) ANTONOV CITED THE UK AS AN EXAMPLE OF WHERE PIGGYBACKING CAUSED A LACK OF TRANSPARENCY,

SINCE
IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO TELL WHERE A PIGGYBACKING COUNTRY'S
MONEY
HAD GONE. SEVERAL DELEGATIONS RESPONDED, MAKING A COMPELLING
CASE
FOR SMALLER DONORS' USE OF LARGER DONORS' ADMINISTRATIVE
CAPABILITIES AND ESTABLISHED LEGAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE
RUSSIAN
AUTHORITIES. THE UK REP CALLED ANTONOV'S ATTENTION TO PAGE
47 OF
THE (120 PAGE) UK BROCHURE, "GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION
PROGRAMME",
WHICH COVERED IN DETAIL THE SOURCES AND PROJECTS OF THE
STERLING
61 MILLION CONTRIBUTED BY SOME DOZEN PIGGYBACKERS ON UK GP
PROGRAMS.

18. (U) IN THE FACE OF EVIDENT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ON A
HOST OF
IMPLEMENTATION QUESTIONS, JAPANESE CHAIR (MORINO) SAID HE
MIGHT
SUGGEST THAT THE APRIL 23 GPWG INCLUDE A DISCUSSION ON
PROJECT
COORDINATION INVOLVING AGENCY EXPERTS, CONTRACTORS,
SUBCONTRACTORS,
ETC. IT REMAINS TO BE SEEN WHETHER MORINO NOW INTENDS TO
MAKE SUCH
A DISCUSSION PART OF THE APRIL GPWG. (THE U.S. WILL MAKE
CLEAR TO
MORINO THAT SUCH ISSUES ARE BEST ADDRESSED IN A BILATERAL
CONTEXT
IN DIRECT CONTACTS BETWEEN DONORS AND RUSSIA AND THAT IT IS
DIFFICULT
TO SEE WHAT EXPERTS FROM A NUMBER OF COUNTRIES COULD
ACCOMPLISH IN
ONE OR TWO DAYS IN TOKYO.)

BRIEFINGS ON THE GLOBAL WMD THREAT

19. (SBU) A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE IAEA MADE A FULL
PRESENTATION ON
THE NUCLEAR THREAT FROM ITS PERSPECTIVE, THOUGH NOTING THAT
HIS
ORGANIZATION'S CHARTER DID NOT CONCERN ITSELF WITH DEFINING
TERRORISM
OR COLLECTING INFORMATION ON TERRORIST GROUPS. IN ITS
REASSESSMENT
OF NUCLEAR SECURITY, THE IAEA HAD CONCLUDED THE NUCLEAR
TERRORISM
THREAT CONSISTED OF, IN ASCENDING ORDER: A) THEFT OF A
NUCLEAR WEAPON;
B) A DIRTY BOMB; OR, C) SABOTAGE OF A NUCLEAR
INSTALLATION/POWER
PLANT. THERE HAD BEEN 1340 RELEVANT INCIDENTS RECORDED.
PAST
BEHAVIOR WAS THE KEY GUIDE TO TERRORISTS' INTENTIONS. BIN
LADEN AND
OTHERS WERE QUOTED ON THE ACQUISITION OF WMD. ATTEMPTS TO
BREAK INTO
RUSSIAN WEAPONS INSTALLATIONS WERE CITED, AS WERE A NUMBER OF
NUCLEAR
TRAFFICKING INCIDENTS.

110. (SBU) THE U.S. PRESENTATION COVERED NUMEROUS UNCLASSIFIED
CASES
WHERE WEAPONS OR MATERIALS OF MASS DESTRUCTION --
RADIOLOGICAL AND
BIOLOGICAL, AS WELL AS NUCLEAR -- WERE EITHER THE OBJECTIVES
OR AT
RISK OF ACQUISITION BY TERRORIST GROUPS. THE BRIEFING NOTED
THAT,
WITH INCREASED GLOBALIZATION IN TRANSPORTATION AND
COMMUNICATIONS,
PROLIFERATORS AND TERRORISTS FOUND IT MUCH EASIER TO OBTAIN
THESE
MATERIALS. THE INCIDENTS CITED COVERED ASIA, EUROPE AND

LATIN
AMERICA AND INVOLVED EQUIPMENT, WEAPONS, MATERIALS AND THE
KNOWLEDGE
TO MAKE USE OF THEM.

¶11. (SBU) FRANCE MADE A BRIEF INTERVENTION ON SECURITY ISSUES
CONCERNING CATEGORY I RADIOLOGICAL SOURCES IN FRANCOPHONE
AFRICA,
WHICH IT SAID TESTIFIED TO THE LEGITIMACY OF GP EXPANSION.

¶12. (SBU) AUSTRALIA REVIEWED INCIDENTS INVOLVING TERRORIST
GROUPS
IN THE SOUTHEAST ASIA REGION AS WELL AS THE
LESS-THAN-ADEQUATELY
ADDRESSED VULNERABILITIES OF BIOLOGICAL AGENTS AND CHEMICAL
TOXINS
IN THE AREA.

CONCLUSIONS DRAWN

¶13. (SBU) WITH REGARD TO THE THREAT BRIEFINGS, THERE APPEARED
TO BE
A GENERAL CONSENSUS THAT THEY WERE SUGGESTIVE OF A WORLDWIDE
THREAT
AND THE RISK THAT CURRENT EFFORTS MIGHT LEAVE GAPS THAT COULD
BE
EXPLOITED BY TERRORIST GROUPS. U.S. REP HAYWARD AGAIN
AFFIRMED THE
U.S. COMMITMENT TO DEAL WITH THE PROLIFERATION POTENTIAL
REPRESENTED
BY UNSECURED MATERIALS AND TECHNOLOGICAL EXPERTISE IN RUSSIA
AND OTHER
AREAS OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION BY FINISHING THE JOB THERE.
AT THE
SAME TIME, SHE SAID, THE THREAT WAS NOT STATIC, BUT EVOLVING,
AND THE
GP NEEDED TO BE READY TO RESPOND TO IT ON A GLOBAL BASIS, AS
DEMONSTRATED IN THE COURSE OF THE THREAT BRIEFINGS. THE TIME
WAS
RIPE TO LOOK TO NEW DONORS, NEW RESOURCES THAT WOULD BE
APPLIED TO
THE REGIONS DOCUMENTED IN THE BRIEFINGS. SHE FURTHER NOTED
THAT THE
GP HAS IN FACT ALREADY EXPANDED, AND IT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE
PARTNERSHIP TO ACKNOWLEDGE THIS.

¶14. (SBU) GERMANY, JAPAN, SWITZERLAND, CANADA, AND THE UK
TOOK THE FLOOR I
N SUPPORT OF IMMEDIATE GEOGRAPHIC EXPANSION TO DEAL WITH
GLOBAL THREATS
THAT, AS JAPAN SAID, SHOULD NOT BE LEFT UNADDRESSED. GERMANY
ADDED THAT
IT COULD NOT ACCEPT A DECISION FOR EXTENSION BEYOND 2012 AND
CAUTIONED
THAT ANY NEW GP DONORS SHOULD BE CAREFULLY CONSIDERED FROM
THE POINT OF
VIEW OF LIKEMINDEDNESS, A POINT LATER ECHOED BY JAPAN AND
RUSSIA. ALSO,
TOO MANY GP PARTNERS MIGHT MAKE COORDINATION DIFFICULT,
ACCORDING TO THE
GERMAN REPRESENTATIVE.

¶15. (SBU) ON THE U.S. SUGGESTION THAT POTENTIAL NEW DONORS BE
APPROACHED
IN CAPITALS AND/OR THAT AN OUTREACH SESSION BE HELD FOR THEM
IN CONNECTION
WITH THE APRIL GPWG, JAPAN POINTED TO THE CONCEPTUAL
AWKWARDNESS OF FORMAL
DISCUSSIONS WITH NEW DONORS IN THE ABSENCE OF A GP DECISION
TO ADMIT THEM.
INSTEAD, THE JAPANESE SUGGESTED THERE COULD BE INFORMAL
DISCUSSIONS WITH
COUNTRIES OUTSIDE THE GP, INCLUDING POTENTIAL NEW DONORS, IN
ORDER TO
ACQUAINT THEM WITH THE GP.

¶16. (SBU) RUSSIA (ROZHKOV) AGREED THAT THE THREAT BRIEFINGS HAD SHOWN THE DANGERS THAT EXISTED IN VARIOUS PARTS OF THE WORLD. SUCH DANGERS MIGHT EVEN BE MORE EXTENSIVE THAN SUGGESTED IN THE BRIEFINGS. IT WAS ALSO TRUE THAT MOST OF THE TASKS INVOLVED IN COPING WITH SUCH THREATS RELATED TO THE KANANASKIS PRINCIPLES. AT THE SAME TIME, HOWEVER, THERE WERE OTHER, EXISTING, GLOBAL INSTRUMENTS (IAEA, ETC.) TO ADDRESS THESE ADMITTEDLY GLOBAL THREATS. MOREOVER, THREAT ASSESSMENT WAS NOT REALLY A TASK FOR WHICH THE GP HAD BEEN DESIGNED. WHAT NEEDED TO BE UNDERLINED WAS THAT THE GP WAS A UNIQUE INSTRUMENT INTENDED TO BRING POLITICAL WILL AND RESOURCES TO BEAR IN SPECIFIC COUNTRIES (RUSSIA AND THE REST OF THE FSU). THAT WAS TO BE THE FIRST STAGE. AND, WITH THE FIRST STAGE ONLY 26 PERCENT COMPLETED, IT WAS NOT TIME TO GO LOOKING FOR NEW TASKS -- TASKS FOR WHICH NO SPECIFIC NEW DONORS WITH RESOURCES HAD BEEN IDENTIFIED, NO SPECIFIC PROJECTS PREPARED, AND NO SPECIFIC WILLING RECIPIENTS RECRUITED.

¶17. (SBU) ROZHKOV CONCLUDED BY READING THE RELEVANT EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE HEILIGENDAMM SUMMIT, CLEARLY INDICATING THAT RUSSIA WOULD AGREE TO SIMILAR SUMMIT LANGUAGE FOR THIS YEAR, RESTATING THE GEOGRAPHICALLY GLOBAL VOCATION OF THE GP, BUT AGAIN ONLY IN PRINCIPLE AND ONLY AS AN ISSUE TO BE EXPLORED FURTHER.

ON THE MARGINS

¶18. (SBU) ASKED PRIVATELY ABOUT HIS GOVERNMENT'S STAND ON EXTENSION OF THE GP BEYOND 2012, THE GERMAN REPRESENTATIVE SAID HIS INSTRUCTIONS HAD TWO REDLINES: NO AGREEMENT ON EXTENSION BEYOND 2012 AND NO NEW GERMAN FUNDS FOR THE GP BEFORE THEN. PERSONALLY, HE WAS CONFIDENT THAT THERE WOULD BE EVENTUAL AGREEMENT ON GP EXTENSION, BUT HE FELT GERMANY WOULD NOT BE READY TO ADDRESS THIS BEFORE 2010. WITH REGARD TO FUNDING FOR PROJECTS BEYOND THE FORMER SOVIET UNION IN A GEOGRAPHICALLY EXPANDED GP, GERMANY HAD BEEN THINKING THAT SOME OF THE FUNDS ALREADY PLEDGED BUT NOT YET COMMITTED TO RUSSIA MIGHT BE USED.

¶19. (SBU) DURING A PRE-GPWG BREAKFAST U.S.-JAPAN BILATERAL, MORINO NOTED THE AWKWARDNESS OF TRYING TO ATTRACT NEW DONOR GOVERNMENTS IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY AGREEMENT TO ACCEPT THEM INTO THE G-8'S GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP. NONETHELESS, HE ACCEPTED THE U.S. PLAN TO APPROACH POTENTIAL NEW DONORS ON AN INFORMAL BASIS AND SUGGESTED KAZAKHSTAN AS A GOOD START.

¶20. (SBU) SEVERAL ATTEMPTS TO ENGAGE THE RUSSIAN DELEGATION IN AN EXPLORATION OF POSSIBLE SUMMIT LANGUAGE COMPROMISES THAT MIGHT ACCOMPLISH EFFECTIVE GP GEOGRAPHIC EXPANSION ENDED WITH ROZHKOV'S FLAT DECLARATION THAT MOSCOW HAD DECIDED THERE WOULD BE NO SUCH LANGUAGE THIS YEAR.

LOOKING AHEAD

¶21. (SBU) THE JAPANESE CHAIR HAS SIGNALLED ITS RELUCTANCE
WITH REGARD TO
FORMAL APPROACHES TO NEW DONORS, AND TIME IS SHORT TO AFFECT
RUSSIA'S STAND
AGAINST GP EXPANSION IN TIME FOR THIS YEAR'S SUMMIT.
NONETHELESS, THE U.S.
IS PREPARING TO OPEN INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS WITH SOME POTENTIAL
NEW DONORS IN
ORDER TO BEGIN LAYING THE GROUNDWORK FOR ADDRESSING RUSSIA'S
OBJECTIONS THAT
NO DONORS, PROJECTS, OR RECIPIENTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED, AS
WELL AS TO ALLAY
THE RUSSIANS' BASIC CONCERN THAT EXPANSION WOULD MEAN
DIVERSION OF ALREADY
PLEDGED FUNDS AWAY FROM THEM.

¶22. (U) THIS EXPANDED GPWG SESSION INCLUDED THE G-8 PLUS
TWELVE OTHER DONOR
NATIONS, THE EU COUNCIL SECRETARIAT, THE EU COMMISSION, THE
IAEA, AND UKRAINE.
THE NEXT GPWG, SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 23 IN TOKYO, WILL INCLUDE
ONLY THE G-8, PLUS
THE EU.
RICE